

## REMARKS

By this paper, claim 1 has been amended and claim 8 has been canceled. Claims 1, 3-6, 12, 13, 15, 16 and 43-49 are pending.

In the outstanding Office action dated January 29, 2007, claims 1, 3-6, 8, 12, 13, 15, 16 and 43-47 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph as failing to comply with the written description requirement. In particular, the Examiner stated that the specification as filed "fails to supply support for the limitation wherein the 'filament is generally tubular'. The specification as filed discloses the filament can be formed or made from a tube, which does not necessarily mean the filament is tubular, or even broader 'generally tubular.'" The Applicants respectfully traverse the § 112, first paragraph rejection of the claims. The Applicants have nevertheless deleted the word "generally" from independent claim 1 so as to clearly place independent claim 1 and its dependent claims in a condition for allowance. Significantly, the American Heritage Dictionary defines the term tubular as: "1. Of or pertaining to a tube. 2. Having the form of a tube. 3. Constituting or consisting of tubes." Accordingly, since the specification of the present application states that a filament "can be formed or made from a tube," it is believed that modifying the term "filament" in claim 1 with the term "tubular" is supported by the specification and as such, the requirements of § 112, first paragraph are thereby satisfied.

Moreover, in the outstanding Office action, claims 1, 6, 8, 43, 44 and 47 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pulnev et al. (6,007,574) in view of Leone et al. (5,902,266); claims 46, 48 and 49 were rejected under § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pulnev et al. in view of Leone et al. as applied to claim 1 and further in view of Kavteladze et al. (5,643,339); and claim 15 was rejected under § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pulnev et al. in view of Leone et al. as applied to claim 1 and further in view of Hyodoh et al. (2003/0040772).

It is respectfully submitted, however, that the cited art does not teach the subject matter recited in amended claim 1. In particular, it is submitted that the cited art does not teach a device including a tubular elongate filament configured to form a generally tubular body having first and second ends defined by a plurality of circumferentially spaced endless reversals of direction of the filament, wherein at least one of the plurality of reversals embody a full-turn helical configuration. Notably, whereas certain prior art references may disclose a reversal similar to that shown in FIG. 5 of the present application, the art does not teach or contemplate the full-turn helical reversal depicted in FIG. 8 of the present application. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that independent claim 1 as well as its dependent claims recite subject matter which is allowable.

### CONCLUSION

In view of the above remarks, Applicants respectfully request that the application be reconsidered, the claims allowed and the application passed to issue.

Respectfully submitted,  
FULWIDER PATTON LLP

By: /John V. Hanley/  
John V. Hanley  
Registration No. 38,171

JVH/kst  
Howard Hughes Center  
6060 Center Drive, Tenth Floor  
Los Angeles, CA 90045  
Telephone: (310) 824-5555  
Facsimile: (310) 824-9696  
Customer No. 24201  
164453.1